

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Madour et al. (US #6,912,214). With respect to independent claim 1, on pages 6 and 7 of the office action, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 2, step 27 reads on “receiving stored service configuration information from a PCF.” The Examiner cites step 28 as describing “the dormant packet-data session is reactivated by reallocating a traffic channel so that the data can be transferred.” Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the base station receives a message containing stored service configuration information from the packet control function. Further, claim 1 has been amended to define service configuration information as at least one of a service referenced identifier (SR_ID) or a service option, in accordance to how service configuration information is defined in the patent application specification on page 3, lines 22-23.

Step 27 in FIG. 2 of Madour illustrates messaging between the PCF and PDSN, not between the PCF and base station. Further the A11 registration Request message with lifetime set to 0 sent from the PCF to the PDSN does not contain a service referenced identifier or a service option. Step 28 in FIG. 2 of Madour illustrates the PCF sending an A9-Update-A8 Ack to the BSC. This merely acknowledges the A9-Update-A8 message received by the PCF. The A9-Update-A8 message does not read on the base station reactivating the dormant packet data session using the stored service configuration information and sending a message containing a SYNC_ID to notify a mobile station to use its stored service configuration. Applicants asserts that there are no figures or description in Madour that read on claim 1 as amended.

Claims 5 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon the rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Independent claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable dependent claim 9. Claim 9 has been canceled.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that claims 3-7, 10 and 11 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1

and 8, respectively. Dependent claim 2 has been canceled. Applicants request removal of the final rejection in this case and timely allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Sayeedi, Shahab et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Lalita W. Pace/

Lalita W. Pace
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 39,427
Telephone: 847-538-5855
Fax: 847-576-3750